

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

CAROLYN SIOUX GREEN,

Plaintiff,  
v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

## Defendants.

CASE NO. C20-6112 BHS

## ORDER

V.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

## Defendants.

THIS MATTER is before the Court on pro se plaintiff Caroline Sioux Green’s  
Motion to Re-Open to Satisfy the Supreme Court of the United States and the Ninth  
Circuit, Dkt. 121, Green’s Motion for Joinder, Dkt. 124, Green’s Motion to Consolidate,  
Dkt. 125, and Green’s Motion to Consolidate and or Joinder, Bankruptcy case, Dkt. 131.

Green sued in September 2020, alleging that a variety of defendants violated her rights in 2001, when she was involuntarily civilly committed. *See generally* Dkt. 1-2. In 2021, Green voluntarily dismissed this case and the Court entered a judgment. Dkts. 119 and 120. She filed a similar case asserting tort claims arising from the same 2001 involuntary commitment, *Green v. United States, et al.*, Cause No. 21-cv-1276 RAJ. *See* Dkt. 1. In that case, Judge Richard Jones dismissed that second case with prejudice as

1 time-barred, Dkt. 253. Green attempted to appeal, Dkt. 255, but the Ninth Circuit noted  
2 that Green's motion for reconsideration was still pending in District Court. Dkt. 276.  
3 Judge Jones denied the motion for reconsideration. Dkt. 281. It is not clear whether  
4 Green is now pursuing her appeal in that case. According to the Court's CM/ECF docket,  
5 that case, like this one, has been dismissed and is closed.

6 Nevertheless, Green's motions in this case seem to suggest that she seeks to re-  
7 open this case to "satisfy" the Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit, Dkt. 121, to "join" in  
8 this case several medical providers she alleges are responsible for her commitment, Dkt.  
9 124, and to consolidate this dismissed case with Judge Jones's case, Dkt. 125. Her most  
10 recent motion references consolidating this closed case with a bankruptcy case she is  
11 hoping to file in Arizona. Dkt. 131 at 1. She concedes such an action would be  
12 "unprecedented." *Id.* at 4.

13 Green's filings are difficult to follow. It is not clear that Green has a case pending  
14 with the Supreme Court. Nor is it clear why it is necessary for this Court to reopen  
15 Green's case in order for the Supreme Court to proceed with her alleged claim before it.  
16 And it is not clear why she believes that the United States Supreme Court or the Ninth  
17 Circuit would be "satisfied" if this case were re-opened.

18 The United States opposes re-opening this long-closed case, pointing out that  
19 Green has not identified any basis or purpose for doing so, and further asserting that  
20 Judge Jones already denied a similar request in his case. It argues that Green effectively  
21 asks this Court to overrule Judge Jones's decision. Dkt. 122 at 3.

1 Green's reply does not clarify the issues. She asserts that her current goal is to  
 2 restore her "firearm rights" in each state other than Washington (which apparently  
 3 restored her rights in 2019). Dkt. 125 at 2. This claim is wholly unrelated to the claims in  
 4 this case. Green's reply also appears to complain about ongoing, unexplained  
 5 proceedings in state court. *Id.* at 3.

6 But this Court cannot and will not review or reverse decisions made in state court.  
 7 The *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine precludes "cases brought by state-court losers complaining  
 8 of injuries caused by state-court judgments . . . and inviting district court review and  
 9 rejection of those judgments." *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S.  
 10 280, 284 (2005). "[W]hen a losing plaintiff in state court brings a suit in federal district  
 11 court asserting as legal wrongs the allegedly erroneous legal rulings of the state court and  
 12 seeks to vacate or set aside the judgment of that court, the federal suit is a forbidden de  
 13 facto appeal." *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Carmona v.*  
 14 *Carmona*, 603 F.3d 1041, 1050 (9th Cir. 2008). If and to the extent Green asks this Court  
 15 to reverse or otherwise undo or interfere with a state court proceeding, this Court has no  
 16 jurisdiction to do so.

17 Green has identified no basis and no purpose in re-opening this case, or combining  
 18 it with a different closed case, or with a future bankruptcy case in a different jurisdiction.  
 19 Her motions are **DENIED**. The case remains closed.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 //

22 //

1 Dated this 8th day of September, 2023.

2  
3  
4



5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
United States District Judge